

6 January 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Reply to Gordon Gray's Memorandum of December 16, 1960 concerning the Recommendation of the President's Board on the Organization of the Clandestine Services

Prior to signing the attached draft which was prepared in the DD/P, I would like to call the following items to your attention.

a. I do not feel that this memorandum really faces up to the basic recommendation of the President's Board that the DD/P be relieved of reporting and evaluating the political, psychological and paramilitary operations of the Agency, and for formulating the intelligence recommendations which form the basis for plans for such operations. This memo says, in effect, that the DD/P exercises great caution to insure that he gets objective intelligence as a basis for planning his operations. On the other hand, the simple facts are that it is still a DD/P responsibility to handle the two functions which the President's Board suggested be placed elsewhere. I think this reply would be much better if we simply state that after examining the situation the CIA decided not to make any changes and that the CIA believes that this is the better organization.

b. I would point out to you that paragraph 5 does not represent any change in a procedure which has been followed for many years.

Note: Copy of this memo not returned w/ signed memo to [unclear]

c. You will note that paragraph 6 gives the impression that a "new Assistant Deputy Director (Plans) for Psychological and Paramilitary Operations was appointed", at least conveying the impression to me that this was a new job. What they actually mean is that [] took a position that had been held by [] and also which had been vacant for a period.

d. Paragraph 6 also gives the impression that when I&R was abolished something was added to the responsibilities of the Inspector General. This is not true. The Inspector General always did operational reviews as part of inspections. Further, we had repeatedly told the President's Board that this was the case.

e. Paragraph 7 represents basically nothing new except some modification or refinement of procedures.

f. Paragraph 15.a. implies that the DPD was a new creation. Actually it was simply the AQUATONE staff of Bissell's which moved over to the DD/P.

g. Does paragraph 18 represent any change, or were division staff personnel simply re-grouped and given a new name. If it does represent a change, shouldn't we indicate that there was a saving in personnel or manpower?

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General

cc: DDCI